

REMARKS

Specification Amendments. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Quarterman objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive of the invention. The Applicant has amended the title of the invention as suggested by Examiner Quarterman. Withdrawal of the objection to the title of the invention is therefore respectfully requested.

Additionally, in the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Quarterman objected to the drawings for showing a reference character 16 that is not mentioned in the description of FIGS. 1 and 2. The Applicant has amended the specification to include reference character 16 in the description of FIGS. 1 and 2. Withdrawal of the drawing objection is therefore respectfully requested.

The Applicant has also amended the specification herein to correct typographical errors in the specification.

No new matter was introduced by any of the amendments to the specification.

Claim 1 Objection. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Quarterman objected to independent claim 1 for failing to have the term “conductor” in a plural form. The Applicant has amended dependent claim 1 herein to provide the plural form “conductors”, and no new matter was introduced by the amendment to independent claim 1. Withdrawal of the objection to independent claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Quarterman rejected pending claims 1-9 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application:

A. Examiner Quarterman rejected dependent claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite

Examiner Quarterman rejected dependent claim 9 as being indefinite due to a recitation of a broad range/limitation together with a narrow range/limitation that falls within the broad range/limitation. The Applicant has amended dependent claim 9 to delete the recitation to the narrow range/limitation. No new matter was introduced by this amendment of dependent claim 9. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite is therefore respectfully requested.

B. Examiner Quarterman rejected claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB 476,836 A to *Geselleschaft*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Quarterman's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 over *Geselleschaft*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Geselleschaft*. To warrant this §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2, 7 and 8, each and every element as set forth in independent claim 1 must be either expressly or inherently described in *Geselleschaft*. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1, because *Geselleschaft* fails to describe, expressly or inherently, “the outer bulb enclosing the first and second current supply conductors” as originally recited in independent claim 1.

Specifically, a careful review of *Geselleschaft* reveals that *Geselleschaft* in fact describes, as best shown in FIGS. 1 and 2, a lamp base 8 enclosing a first current supply conductor 17 and a second current supply conductor 18 as opposed to an outer bulb 20 enclosing current supply conductors 17 and 18. This description by *Geselleschaft* is supported by the teaching of *Geselleschaft* that the lower ends of a first leadthrough conductor 11 and a second leadthrough conductor 12 must be entered into respective holes 9 and 10 of lamp base 8 in order to connect leadthrough conductors 11 and 12 to the upper ends of respective current supply conductors 17 and 18. See, *Geselleschaft* at column 2, lines 50-54 and column 3, lines 53-57. Thus, *Geselleschaft* clearly fails to describe, expressly or inherently, outer bulb 10 enclosing current supply conductors 17 and 18 as encompassed by the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Geselleschaft* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 7 and 8 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 7 and 8 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2, 7 and 8 are allowable over *Geselleschaft* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Geselleschaft*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Geselleschaft* is therefore respectfully requested.

C. Examiner Quarterman rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 476,836 to *Geselleschaft* in view of EP 0 429 256 A2 to *Olwert*

Claim 9 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 9 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 9 is allowable over *Geselleschaft* in view of *Olwert* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Geselleschaft*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Geselleschaft* in view of *Olwert* is therefore respectfully requested.

July 7, 2008
Atty Docket No.: NL 031218 (79002-41)
Serial No.: 10/574,147
Filed: March 29, 2006
Page 10 of 10

SUMMARY

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Quarterman is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **JULY 7, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,
Guy Jozef Maria Dekkers

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Chris M. Ries
Registration No. 45,799
Attorney for Appellant

WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY,
MCNETT, AND HENRY, LLC.
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

/Darrin Wesley Harris, 40636/
Darrin Wesley Harris
Registration No. 40,636
Attorney for Applicant